DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 940 EA 009 418

AUTHOR Sanchez,Gilbert; Cali, Alfred J.
TITLE A Comparative Study of the Roles and Functions of School Principals and Bilingual Program Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Background; *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; *Bilingual Education; Chief Administrators; *Occupational Information; Principals; Program Descriptions; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data); Time
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to compare time allocations to major functions actually performed and idealized by bilingual administrators and principals; to rank specific procedures used in accomplishing these functions; to determine staffing patterns, and program and organizational characteristics; and to isolate personal/professional demographics of bilingual administrators. Ninety Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII directors in Arizona, California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Texas responded to a survey. Findings showed large similarity in roles based on time allocations to functions, despite differences in organizational factors involving unit responsibility, staff profiles, student characteristics, and functional assignment. Both groups reported a high to moderate sense of autonomy in program leadership. Demographic data descriptive of the bilingual program directors revealed approximately one-third to be females, over two-thirds holding advanced study beyond the master's, and two-thirds certified in administration. Success factors keying on human leadership skills, community leadership, upper administration support needs, and specific capability in business management were identified. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137940

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA FL
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND BILINGUAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

by

Gilbert Sanchez & Alfred J. Cali

State University of New York at Albany

A Symposium Report

Session 4.02

SYMPOSIUM. SIG/RESEARCH IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

American Education Research Association

New York, N.Y.

April 4 - 8, 1977

EA 009 118

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF BILINGUAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Gilbert Sanchez & Alfred J. Cali

This study was designed to compare time allocations to major functions actually performed and idealized by bilingual administrators and principals, to rank specific procedures used in accomplishing these functions; to determine staffing patterns, program and organizational characteristics; and, to isolate person/professional demographics of bilingual administrators.

Title VII Directors in the states of Arizona, California, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico and Texas were surveyed. Of 225 questionnaires mailed, 90 were returned providing a 40 percent useable return. The instrument used was adapted from an 1974 study of school principals in New York State in which 80 percent of all principals in the state responded. Analysis of data was in the form of percentages, average percentages, means and simple rankings.

Findings showed large similarity in roles based on time allocations to functions, despite differences in organizational factors involving unit responsibility; staff profiles; student characteristics and functional assignment. Both groups responded a high to moderate sense of autonomy in program leadership. Demographic data descriptive of the bilingual program directors revealed approximately one-third to be females, over two-thirds holding advanced study beyond the Masters and two-thirds certified in administration. Success factors keying on human leadership skills, community leaderships, upper administration support needs specifice capability in business management ere identified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PART I:

BACKGROUND..... 1
PURPOSE..... 2
METHODOLOGY..... 2
SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES..... 4
RESPONSE..... 5
ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 6

PART II:

FINDINGS - DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS..... 8
Schools Administered..... 8
Socioeconomic Status of Students..... 10
Organizational Structures..... 11
Salaries..... 17

FINDINGS - ROLE ANALYSIS..... 19
Curriculum and Program Development..... 19
Instructional Supervision..... 21
Nonteaching Staff Supervision..... 22
Professional Staff Recruitment and Training..... 23
Discipline and Building Control..... 24
Business and Budget Management..... 26
Scheduling and Coordinating Facilities Use..... 27
Interaction with Community Groups..... 28
Self-Improvement and Professional Activities..... 29
District-Wide Administrative Duties..... 30

FINDINGS - BILINGUAL ORGANIZATIONAL DATA..... 32

FINDINGS - PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL DATA..... 35
Comments on Success, Lack of Success and Training..... 37

PART III:

SUMMARY..... 40
Some Comparisons..... 41
Allocations of Time to Functions..... 42
Bilingual Program Demographics..... 43
Bilingual Directors Demographics..... 44
Factors Related to Success, Lack of Success and Training Needs.. 45

CONCLUSION..... 45

NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH..... 47

SELECTED REFERENCES..... 48

#####

PART I

BACKGROUND

In 1968 the U.S. Congress enacted the Bilingual Education Act (ESEA Title VII) enabling the U.S. Office of Education to fund bilingual programs during 1969.[1] The initial effort was the funding of 69 programs throughout the United States.

While much research has since been done on program development and various aspects of the instructional process within bilingual programs little or no research has been done on the organizational structure of bilingual programs.

It was with this latter observation in mind that the investigators decided to seek ways of studying the administrative structure of bilingual programs. Based upon experience with bilingual programs and with school systems a decision was made that the role and function of the bilingual program director was closely parallel to that of a school principal. It was determined that a survey instrument would be adapted from a questionnaire designed by one of the present investigators for use in a prior study.[2] The intent of the original study was to determine the leadership role and administrative functions of the public school principal. Conducted in the fall of 1974, the original study involved responses from 3,047 principals, 80 percent of all principals in the State of New York. The findings of this study were judged to be a useful basis for comparison with data to be derived from the study of bilingual program directors, assuming that a re-

---

1 Sanchez, Gilbert. An Analysis of the Bilingual Education Act, 1967-68. An unpublished dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1972

2 State of New York, Office of Performance Review, "The Public School Principal--An Overview", December 1974

sonably congruent instrument was to be utilized. This consideration was made a constant in the thinking of the investigators throughout the instrument design and adaptation stages.

PURPOSE

This study of Title VII Bilingual Directors was undertaken to determine:

1. the functions bilingual program directors performed and how much time they allocated to each function, as well as how much time these directors would ideally allocate to each function;

2. the specific procedures and techniques used to accomplish these functions;

3. the general parameters of the position, including staffing patterns, titles and responsibilities held, reporting responsibilities and salaries;

4. the general characteristics of programs, including length of operation, student characteristics, languages and cultures involved, funding level, and judgements regarding operational autonomy;

5. personal/professional demographic information, including sex, age, experience, certification, education and ethnic background;

6. the judgements of the bilingual program directors regarding factors they feel are related to success/failure in the accomplishment of the bilingual program administrator's role, including observations on suggested training and background aspects needed by bilingual program administrators.

Comparison with data derived from the study of school principals would serve as a useful perspective from which to make judgements regarding the comparability of this relatively recent role to the more descernible and established administrative role, the school principal. Since the principals study did not include personal/professional or program related aspects, these data from the bilingual program directors study would serve as simple descriptive data regarding only that respondent group.

METHODOLOGY

The original survey questionnaire, developed by Cali and Fox for use in

a study sponsoredy by the Office of Education Performance Review of the State of New York, was adapted for use in this study.[3] The original questionnaire was sent to a panel of judges informed in the area of bilingual program administrators, education department personnel, university personnel and U.S. Office of Education personnel for review and comment regarding applicability to bilingual program administration and needed revisions. They were also asked to suggest useful items regarding personal/professional and program aspects. Their comments were considered and, in large measure, incorporated into the study instrument used in this research.

The survey instrument was divided into three parts: Part I: Organizational Demographic Data which included 22 items dealing with data such as titles, funding year, financial information, enrollment, staffing, program, administrative relationships, community and student characteristics and the like. Part II: Time Allocations to Functions Performed by Title VII Program Directors was made up of three sections. The first asked that respondents estimate actual percent of time devoted to the accomplishment of each of the major functional areas of responsibility listed. Bilingual directors were also asked to indicate the percent of time they believed should ideally be spent performing each of the major functional areas listed. There were eleven major functions listed: Curriculum and Program development; Instructional Supervision; Nonteaching Staff Supervision; Professional Staff Recruitment and Training; Discipline and

---

3 Alfred J. Cali, Professor of Administration and Edwin C. Fox, Research Fellow served as major design and study coordinators for the principals study. The study and the instrument were designed in cooperation with Peter S. O'Brien and Irving Gladstone of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators Association of New York State, under the direction of Daniel Klepak, then Director of the Office of Education Performance Review.

Building Control; Business and Budget Management; Scheduling and Coordinating Facilities Use; Interaction with Community Groups; Self-Improvement and Professional Activities; District-Wide Administrative Duties; and, Negotiations.

The second section consisted of listings of specific functions or behaviors associated with the accomplishment of each of the major functional areas to which they had just made percentage of time allocations. Respondents were asked to merely check-off the five specific procedures or behaviors that they felt took up the most of their time in the accomplishment of a given major function. These selections were used as the basis for ranking each of the specific procedures listed, as well as ranking any other procedures added by respondents.

The third section of Part II consisted of three open-ended questions asking the bilingual directors to cite factors that they believe are significantly related to success or lack of success in the accomplishment of the director's role and training or background aspects that they felt were important.

Part III: Personal/Professional Demographic Data consisted of 8 items dealing with respondent sex, age, experience in education and administrative roles, certification status and ethnic background. The item on ethnic background was keyed as wholly optional yet the response level was as high as or even higher than most other items.

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

Survey instruments were mailed to 225 Title VII Program Directors in six states.[4] The states selected for this study were: Arizona, California,

---

4 Title VII Program Director; bilingual program director; bilingual director; bilingual administrator; and, director are all used interchangably to identify the subject/respondents in this study.

Massachusetts, New Mexico, New Jersey and Texas. Selection was based on information supplied the investigators by the Office of Bilingual Education, U.S. Office of Education. These states were selected on the basis of the gross financial support for Title VII programs. New York State was omitted from this study due to the fact that an expanded parallel study, dealing in part with similar phenomena is being designed and will be conducted by another researcher in cooperation with Dr. Cali, one of the investigators of this study.

Questionnaires were mailed to all Title VII directors in each of the six states, 225 in number. No follow-up was planned or utilized. No identification of respondents was requested or made, except for the identification of district. A nominal tally of post-marks was used only to determine the state from which the response was sent. No further use of identifiers was or will be made.

RESPONSE

Of the 225 questionnaires sent out, 90 were returned and were found useable, a useable response of 40% which was considered adequate for this study. The response, state by state and total sample was as follows:

States	N	Return	%
Arizona	19	8	42.1
California	108	43	39.8
Massachusetts	7	4	57.1
New Jersey	11	3	27.3
New Mexico	18	6	33.3
Texas	62	26	41.9
Total	225	90	40.0

Recognizing the statistical and analytical limitations of this type of study, no attempt has been made to apply techniques of great precision to the findings. For the most part percentages, average percentages, statistically derived means and simple ranking techniques have been used to present data. Analysis is essentially inspectional and no tests of significance have been made, nor has significance in a statistical sense been stated or implied for any of the data presented here.

Part of the reason for avoiding use of more powerful analysis is our recognition of a major linitation of this study, that is the obvious lack of georgraphic and organizational comparability of the director and principal samples. We are aware of the differences in role that may very well exist even within the principalship were it drawn on a national sample basis, rather than on a one state basis as is the case here. The fact that we have an 80 percent sample of all principals in one state is a strong basis for a one state comparative study. Unfortunately, the bilingual sample size is too constricted in that one state. This study will provide a basis for comparing the New York State bilingual administrators to a national sample. A national sample of principals is being developed and will allow us to make a comparison with the New York State principals study. Then we can deal more adequately with matters of precision, assuming we adjust for some of the slippage resulting from the time between these several studies.

Our main purpose in conducting this study is to provide a data base for such a series of comparative studies, as well as to provide a useful description of the administrative role of bilingual program directors in terms of functions performed and relevant demographics.

PART II

Study findings are reported in this chapter. Findings are presented in five sections. The first two sections present findings that are compared with similar data from the study of school principals. The next three sections present data wholly descriptive of the bilingual administrators and without reference to the principals data. The findings report sections are as follows:

First, demographic findings that are compared to similar findings findings in the principals study including school organization descriptors, staffing, autonomy judgements and salaries;

Second, role analysis compared to the principals study based on actual and ideal time allocations and ranking of specific procedures utilized;

Third, organizational demographic data wholly descriptive of bilingual programs, including titles held, responsibilities of administrators, representation and program aspects;

Fourth, personal/professional demographic data descriptive of bilingual administrators, including sex, age, experience, education, certification, and ethnicity;

Fifth, selected comments on aspects judged to be related to success and lack of success, and suggestions for training of bilingual administrators.

The final chapter summarizes the findings presented in this part and makes recommendations based on the study.

FINDINGS - DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

Schools Administered

The items dealing with school levels or grades administered were not identical for principals and bilingual program directors. The item on the principal form used school designations such as "primary", "middle school", "senior high school" and "vocational school". While useful for the original purposes of that study the item was modified for the bilingual study and actual grade designations were used, i.e., K, 1, 2, 3, etc. While no direct comparison can be made, it is interesting to note that seventy-four percent (74.5) of the principals reported administering schools at the primary, elementary and middle grade levels and thirty-two percent (32.6) reported secondary level units, including vocational schools. This compares with bilingual administrators reporting from seventy-five percent (75.3) to a low of thirty-two percent (32.6) for grade levels K thru 7 in the programs they administer. And, for secondary grades 8 thru 12, these directors reported from thirty percent (30.3) at the 8th grade to twenty-five percent (25.8) at the 12th grade. The mean percentages for these grade levels are fifty-five percent (55.9) for K thru 7 and twenty-eight (28.5) for 8 thru 12. Thus, both the principals and bilingual directors in the sample administer schools or programs that are roughly comparable, i.e., two-thirds elementary level and one-third secondary level for each group.

A major difference in operating responsibility appeared in a comparison of an item dealing with the number of buildings or school units administered by principals and bilingual directors. Approximately eighty-three percent of the principals reported responsibility for only one unit or

building, whereas only fourteen percent (14.8) of the bilingual directors reported one unit. Over fifty percent (54.5) indicated responsibility for four or more units.

Enrollment of schools or programs administered indicates some difference in the size of units for which principals and bilingual directors are responsible. Enrollment data is shown in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1

ENROLLMENT OF UNITS ADMINISTERED
BY PRINCIPALS AND BILINGUAL PROGRAM DIRECTORS
(Percent of Samples)

Enrollment Range	Directors	Principals
199 or less	20.2	2.9
200 -- 399	22.5	10.9
400 -- 599	17.9	24.3
600 -- 799	8.9	22.0
800 -- 999	2.2	14.6
1,000 --1,199	2.2	7.2
1,200 - 1,399	3.4	5.9
1,400 - 1,599	5.6	3.6
1,600 - 1,799	3.4	2.2
1,800 - 1,999	1.2	1.6
2,000 - 2,199	3.4	.7
2,200 or more	8.9	3.3

Inspection of the table reveals that the principals' modal enrollment increment is 400 to 599 compared to a modal increment of 200 to 399 for bilingual directors. Further inspection reveals that while more bilingual directors administer the smaller programs in enrollment units below 1,000, higher percentage administer units having enrollments above 2,000, over twelve percent (12.3) compared to four percent (4.0) of the principals.

Socio-economic Status of Students

Both principals and bilingual program directors were asked to "indicate dominant characteristics of the socioeconomic status of the student body of the unit(s)" administered. In the case of the bilingual program directors the item was keyed to the "general student body of the school unit(s) or building(s)" in which their programs were located to make the response more parallel to the response of principals who were responsible for a whole school population. The responses of bilingual directors and principals are presented on Table 2 below:

TABLE 2

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF STUDENT BODY
AS INDICATED BY BILINGUAL PROGRAM DIRECTORS
AND PRINCIPALS
(Percent of Samples)

Socioeconomic Status	Directors	Principals
low socioeconomic/high minority	70.5	14.2
low socioeconomic/low minority	7.9	14.2
middle socioeconomic/high minority	9.0	5.3
middle socioeconomic/low minority	6.8	46.9
high socioeconomic/high minority	.0	.5
high socioeconomic/low minority	.0	6.3
mixed, all characteristics	7.9	9.8
other	.0	1.7

Inspection of Table 2 clearly indicates that the socioeconomic status of the students in the schools in which the bilingual programs administered by the directors who responded are quite different from those in the schools administered by the majority of the principals. Over seventy percent (70.5)

of the directors indicated "low socioeconomic/high minority" characteristics compared to fourteen percent (14.2) of the principals. The majority of principals, forty-six percent (46.9) indicated that the dominant characteristic was "middle socioeconomic/low minority.

Organizational Structures

Staff characteristics were determined including size of professional staff, titles of professional staff reporting to the principal or director and the size of various categories of non-professional staff. Table 3 contains data regarding the size of the professional staffs administered by Title VII directors and by principals.

TABLE 3

SIZE OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF ADMINISTERED
BY TITLE VII DIRECTORS AND PRINCIPALS
(Percent of Samples)

Staff Size	Directors	Principals
(under 10)	(43.7)	NA
(11-25)	(32.2)	NA
25 or less	75.9	14.1
26-50	13.8	52.2
51-75	4.6	16.6
76-100	3.4	8.4
over 101	2.3	8.7

The item for staff size used with the Title VII directors included two intervals not on the principal's questionnaire. These were designed to gather information on staffs estimated to be below 25 in number, which proved to be a wise decision since over seventy-five percent (75.9) of the directors reported professional staff sizes in the "under 10" and "11 to 25" intervals combined. This compared to fourteen percent (14.1) reported by

Principals for the "25 or less" interval. The modal interval for principals was the "26 to 50" staff size, for directors, using the additional intervals it was the "under 10" category at forty-three percent (43.7).

For further clarification of administrative structures, principals and directors were asked for the number of specific types of professional staff members who reported directly to them. Their responses are shown in Table 4, in terms of the percentage of principals and directors in the study samples.

The response categories were not wholly identical on the principal and director survey forms. Item categories are cited in Table 4 where response percentages are displayed. The modal staff title-number cell for directors, other than the teachers category, was specialists at twenty percent (20.0), followed closely by coordinators at nearly nineteen percent (18.9), both citing only one such staff member per title. The modal staff title number cell for principals was also specialists, but in the six plus cell rather than the one cell. Thus, principals and directors both report specialists as the most prevalent staff function responsible to them, with principals having considerably larger numbers of staff specialists than do directors. A total of forty-seven percent (47.8) of the bilingual directors reported having specialists on staff, compared to eighty-four percent (84.7) of the principals. The next staff title-number cell for principals was assistant principals in the one cell, twenty-five percent (25.1).

Reviewing the zero reporting column reveals that very few bilingual directors seem to have immediate staff administrative support in such titles as "assistant principals", "directors" or "assistant directors". The last title was used on the directors form to adjust for the possibility that the "assistant principal" and "director" titles would not be applicable to a situation where the

primary administrator would be classified as a "program director" or "director". Even so the title "assistant director" staff member cell zero was over ninety-two percent (92.2), thus by deduction approximately eight percent of the directors would have such staff assistance. The primary titles reported by directors as being directly responsible to them would be "specialists", as noted earlier reported by about forty-seven percent (47.8) of the directors; "coordinators" reported by thirty-one percent (31.1); "supervisors" reported by twenty-seven percent (27.8); and "chairpersons" reported by fifteen percent (15.6).

Principals reported staff titles in the following percentages, "specialists" by eighty-four percent (84.7); "assistant principals" by forty-three percent (43.5); "chairpersons" by twenty percent (20.8); and "coordinators" by eighteen percent (18.2). The above percentages were derived by subtracting the percentage of directors or principals reporting zero such staff from 100%.

In addition to supervising professional staff bilingual program directors and principals have administrative responsibility for instructional aides (paraprofessionals) and non-instructional support personnel such as clerical staff and maintenance personnel. The following tables indicate the percentages of directors and principals having various numbers of paraprofessional (Table 5) and non-instructional support staff (Table 6).

TABLE 4

SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROFESSIONALS REPORTING
DIRECTLY TO BILINGUAL PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND PRINCIPALS

Type of Professional Staff	Number of Staff Reporting to Director or Principal													
	0		1		2		3		4		5		6+	
	Dir.	(Prin.)	Dir.	(Prin.)	Dir.	(Prin)	Dir.	(Prin)	(Dir)	(Prin)	Dir	(Prin)	Dir.	(Prin)
Asst. Principals	92.2	(56.5)	4.4	(25.1)	1.1	(9.5)	.0	(4.6)	.0	(1.9)	.0	(.9)	.0	(1.5)
Directors	95.6	(89.5)	3.3	(5.8)	.0	(2.6)	.0	(1.6)	.0	(.8)	.0	(.4)	.0	(.1)
*Asst. Directors	92.2	*	4.4	*	.0	*	4.4	*	1.1	*	.0	*	.0	*
Supervisors	72.2	(92.6)	14.4	(3.4)	4.4	(1.4)	2.2	(.6)	1.1	(.5)	1.1	(.6)	1.1	(.9)
Chairpersons	84.4	(79.2)	10.0	(1.6)	1.1	(1.3)	1.1	(1.0)	.0	(3.1)	.0	(2.9)	1.1	(10.8)
Coordinators	68.9	(81.8)	18.9	(8.0)	3.3	(3.8)	5.6	(1.7)	1.1	(1.9)	2.2	(1.2)	3.3	(1.8)
Specialists	52.2	(15.3)	20.0	(1.8)	8.9	(2.3)	2.2	(5.2)	3.3	(10.1)	5.6	(11.7)	5.6	(53.6)
*Teachers	32.2	*	14.4	*	4.4	*	**	*	5.6	*	1.1	*	34.4	*
**Other	**	(81.3)	**	(6.6)	**	(2.9)		(1.7)	**	(1.1)	**	(.8)	**	(5.7)

NOTE: * Item not on Principals Form ** Item not on Directors Form

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONAL
INSTRUCTIONAL AIDES REPORTED BY BILINGUAL
(Percent of Samples)

Number on Staff	Directors	Principals
None	5.7	15.7
1-5	19.3	48.0
6-10	17.0	18.2
11-15	20.4	6.8
16-20	12.5	4.2
21 or more	24.9	7.1
(21-25)	(4.5)	*
(26 or more)	(20.4)	*

Note: *Intervals not included on principal survey. Percentages in ( ) report the sum of the interval 21 or more.

Inspection of Table 5 reveals that Title VII bilingual directors considerably higher numbers of paraprofessionals than do principals. Even the added intervals 21-25 and 26 or more do not contain the phenomenon since over twenty percent (20.4) of the directors report in the highest and open-ended interval. Principals report highest in the 1-5 interval, with over sixty-six percent (66.2) reporting from 1 to 10 paraprofessionals. This is compared to over fifty-seven percent of the bilingual directors reporting 11 to 26 or more parsprofessional staff.

The situatien with noninstructional support personnel is reversed. Two thirds of the bilingual directors, sixty-six percent (66.7) report from 1 to 5 such staff. This is compared to principals who report over twenty-three percent (23.8) in the 1 to 5 interval and over seventy-five percent (75.4) in the 6 to 21 or more categories. Thus, principals have responsibility for higher numbers of noninstructional support personnel than do the directors of bilingual programs.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF NONINSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL
REPORTED BY BILINGUAL PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND PRINCIPALS
(Percent of Samples)

Number on Staff	Directors	Principals
None	6.7	.8
1-5	66.7	23.8
6-10	7.9	29.0
11-15	6.7	21.5
16-20	3.4	11.4
21 or more	5.7	13.5
(21-25)	(.0)	*
(26-30)	(I.2)	*
(31 or more)	(4.5)	*

Note: *Intervals not included on principal survey. Percentages in ( ) report sum of interval 21 or more.

When asked to judge their administrative autonomy regarding curriculum, instructional and program decisions the bilingual directors' and principals' responses varied as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF TITLE VII DIRECTORS AND PRINCIPALS
JUDGEMENTS REGARDING THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE ANONOMY
(Percent of Samples)

Degree of Autonomy	Directors	Principals
highly autonomous	36.4	26.0
moderately autonomous	36.4	48.0
moderately restricted	18.2	20.1
highly restricted	9.0	4.8

Review of Table 7 indicates that bilingual directors and principals are highly similar in their judgements regarding autonomy. Both groups of administrators report out nearly three-fourths feeling a "moderate" to "high" sense of autonomy, seventy-two percent (72.8) of the directors

and seventy-four percent (74.0) of the principals making those judgments. The major difference lies at the extremes where thirty-six percent (36.4) of the "highly autonomous" compared to twenty-six percent (26.0) of the principals, and at the "highly restricted" category where nine percent (9.0) of the directors report such feelings compared to less than five percent (4.8) of the principals.

Salaries

When asked to indicate the range within which their salaries fell, directors and principals responded as indicated on Table 8.

TABLE 8

SALARY RANGES REPORTED BY TITLE VII DIRECTORS AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Salary Range	Directors	Principals
under $15,000	14.3	1.5
$15,000-$17.000	23.8	6.4
$17,501-$20,000	20.2	15.8
$20,001-$22,500	15.5	17.5
$22,501-$25,000	11.9	14.7
$25,001-$27,500	3.6	14.3
$27,501-$30,000	8.3	18.7
$30,001-$32,500	.0	6.8
$32,501-$35,000	1.2	3.2
$35,001-$37,500	.0	.4
$37,501-$40,000	.0	.0
over $40,000	1.2	.0

The greatest number of Title VII directors reported salaries in the $15,000-$17,000 range. Over fifty-eight percent (58.3) reported salaries at or below $20,000. A median salary cannot be accurately reported by these data, but the median salary would no doubt be less than $20,000, in the $17,501 to $20,000 salary interval. This is compared to principals where the greatest number reported that their salaries fell in the $27,500 to

$30,000 range. Fifty-five percent (55.9) reported salaries falling at $25,000 or below, an estimated median salary would be less than $25,000, in the $22,501 to $25,000 interval. Two percent (2.4) of the directors report salaries above $30,000, with one person reporting a salary above $40,000. Ten percent (10.4) of the principals reported salaries above $30,000, none above $37,500. The greatest difference lies in the less than $17,000 ranges where fourteen percent (14.3) of the bilingual directors report salaries of $15,000 to $17,000 range. Only seven percent (7.9) of the principals report salaries of less than $17,000, only one and one-half percent (1.5) in the less than $15,000 range.

Even roughly derived the salary discrepancy is large as reported. When one considers the reporting dates of the comparative studies and salary increases that principals may have received in the interim, the real difference can be assumed to be even greater than indicated.

Title VII Program Directors and principals were asked to indicate the percent of time their roles required them to actually spend performing major functional areas of responsibility. In addition they were asked to list the percent of time they believed should be ideally allocated to the performance of each major function. Finally, respondents to both surveys were asked to indicate the five procedures which actually take up the most of their time in the performance of each major function.

Comparison of Time Allocations to Functions Performed and Idealized by Bilingual Program Directors and School Principals

On the following pages each area of major functional responsibility is examined. Average percentages of time allocated to each major function, both actual and ideal, are shown for each group of respondents. Differences in the average percent of times estimated for both actual and ideal times stated by each group, as well as differences in the percentage time allocations between each group are also shown. Differences are computed by subtracting actual average allocations from ideal average allocations and by subtracting principals' actual and ideal time allocations from the comparable allocations of bilingual program directors. Top ranking specific procedures performed are included in the discussion of each major function, the others are presented in rank listings.

Curriculum and Program Development:

Bilingual program directors indicated spending an average of 17.6 percent of their time on this function, compared to 14.6 percent spent by school principals. Directors would ideally prefer to allocate an average of 22.5 percent of their time on this function, compared to an idealized allocation of 21.1 percent on the part of principals. Thus each group indicates a desire to increase the amount of time they spend on this function as shown in Figure A.

FIGURE A

CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	17.6	22.5	+4.9
Principals	14.6	21.1	+6.5
	+3.0	+1.4	differences

The listing of specific procedures used to accomplish the curriculum and program development function shows a generally close pattern of performance especially in the top six or seven ranks.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Curriculum and Program Development Function

Specific Procedures	Directors	Principals
- Confer with other administrators in district and/or superintendent	1	4
- Confer with individual teachers	2	1
- Conduct curriculum change and improvement programs with staff	3	2
- Confer with school administrative and supervisory staff	4	3
- Selection and purchase of bilingual materials	5.5	NA
- Make available conferences and workshops with university or professional groups	6	8
- Read and study curriculum materials and related publications	7	5
- Confer with state and federal office personnel	8	NA
- Make available conferences and/or workshops with state and federal office personnel	9	14
- Confer with individuals and leaders in the community	10	11
- Make available meetings with curriculum research agency personnel	11	13
- Confer with individual parents	12	7
- Confer with guidance and pupil personnel staff	13	6
- Other (writing interim reports, grant applications)	14	12
- Meet with civic groups, business groups	15.5	15
- Meet with student representatives	15.5	9

The average percent of time allocated to this function seems to reveal a rather large difference in point of view as well as performance manifested by the respondents. Bilingual directors indicate an average of 10.7 percent of their time is devoted to instructional supervision. This is compared to 19.1 percent on the part of principals. Both the directors and the principals desire to increase the time devoted to this function, but the differences widen with 14.6 percent idealized by directors and 26.3 percent idealized by principals as shown in Figure B.

FIGURE B

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION FUNCTION

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	10.7	14.6	+3.9
Principals	19.1	26.3	+7.2
	+8.4	+11.7	differences

The specific procedures utilized to accomplish this function show rather wide variance in rankings between bilingual administrators and school principals. This would have a tendancy to support in another way the apparent difference in role ascribed to this function by directors and principals.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Instructional Supervision Function

Specific Procedures	Directors	Principals
- Collection and Analysis of student performance data (evaluation)	1	7
- Schedule and conduct classroom observations of teachers	2	1
- Preparing written reports on instructional program	3	12
- Arranging or procuring instructional	4	5
- Conducting special improvement programs for teachers needing help.	5	10
- Conference with chairpersons, coordinators/ supervisors on teacher performance	6	8
- Arrange and coordinate student testing program	7	14

Specific Procedures	Directors	Principals
- Pre-visitation and follow-up	8	2
- Preparation and filing written record of observations/conferences	9	3
- Dealing with job-hindering personal problems	10	9
- Development of teacher evaluation program and guides	11	13
- Preparation of staff retention, transfer and dismissal recommendations	12	11
- Confer with students/parents on instructional/teacher problems	13.5	4
- Review of lesson plans, unit plans, program reports	13.5	6
- Other (provide ideas, concepts, strategies for implementation, etc.)	14	15

Nonteaching Staff Supervision

Both directors and principals idealize a reduction in the percent of their time devoted to nonteaching staff supervision. Actually spending an average of 8.1 percent of their time on this function, bilingual directors would prefer to spend 6.9 percent. Principals would reduce their actual average of 5.4 percent to an ideal time of 3.9 percent on noninstructional staff supervision. These time preferences are displayed in Figure C.

FIGURE C

NON TEACHING STAFF SUPERVISION

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	8.1	6.9	-1.2
Principals	5.4	3.9	-1.5
	+2.7	+3.0	differences

The widest rank differences between the bilingual directors' choices of nonteaching staff supervision procedures and those made by principals seem to occur between human and facilities items. For example, bilingual directors place "development and conduct of inservice programs for employees" at the 2nd rank level, for principals it is 11th. Principals place "inspection of work areas in building or on grounds" in 2nd rank, compared to 10th rank for directors.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Non-Teaching Staff Supervision

Specific Procedures	Directors	Principals
- Observation of staff and informal discussion of needs/problems	1	1
- Development and conduct of in-service programs for employees	2	11
- Development of improved administrative procedures	3	3
- Periodic written evaluation of observations and conferences	4	9
- Resolution of staff conflicts	5	6
- Confer with teachers on clerical and other service staff relations	6	5
- Development of improved procedures: clerical, custodial.	7	3
- Discussion of job-hindering personal problems	8	8
- Making recommendations for retention, promotion, reassignment or dismissal	9.5	10
- Development of improved pupil- personnel procedures	9.5	7
- Inspection of work areas in building or on grounds	10	2
- Other (better working relationships)	11	12

Professional Staff Recruitment and Training

Devoting 9.1 percent of their time, on the average, to professional staff recruitment and training the bilingual directors appear to be reasonably satisfied with this allocation. The idealized allocation for this function is increased only .3 percent to a total of 9.4 percent by the directors. Principals devote 5.1 percent of their time to this function and appear to be satisfied with less time idealized to this function than directors, but somewhat move than they now actually utilize--idealizing an increase to 6.5 percent. Allocation revisions to professional staff recruitment and training are displayed in Figure D.

FIGURE D

PROFESSIONAL STAFF RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	9.1	9.4	+ .3
Principals	5.1	6.5	+1.4
	+4.0	+2.9	differences

There is little congruence between the procedures rankings of bilingual program directors and those of principals. Only two of the directors top five ranked procedures are included in those in the top five as ranked by principals. In most cases individualized relationships between administrators and personnel are given higher rankings by principals than by bilingual directors.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Professional Staff Recruitment and Training

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Arranging in-service programs for groups/ individual teachers	1	10
- Meeting with supervisors and teachers on in-service programs	2	9
- Development of staff needs and qualification requests	3	6
- Orientation of new teachers to instructional program and available resources	4	1
- Participation in teacher application screening and interviews	5	2
- Coordination of university programs	6	*
- Special conference with personnel on progress/needs	7.5	5
- Preparation of written reports and records of screening and selection	7.5	11
- Planning and conducting of faculty meetings	8	3
- Conferences with other administrators on screening and final selection	9	7
- Observation of personnel performance in general school activities	10	4
- Assisting new personnel with employment information	11	8
- Development of district-wide personnel policy or regulations	12	12

*Item used on directors' survey only.

Discipline and Building Control

This function, as demonstrated by the large difference between actual and idealized percentages, is very likely the most rejected responsibility in the view of both directors and principals. More so in the case of principals since they now devote 19.0 percent of their time to discipline and idealize a reduction to an average of 8.1 percent. Directors, who apparently do very little with this function, 1.6 percent of their average time allocation is so -

devoted also desire a further reduction to 1.4 percent. To be wholly accurate the closeness of these percentages, based on the technique used, can hardly be prescribed to a desire to reduce. It can be asserted that directors view their roles as involving a minimum of discipline and desiring it to remain at a minimum. Discipline and building control percentages and differences are shown in Figure E.

FIGURE E

DISCIPLINE AND BUILDING CONTROL

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	1.6	1.4	- .2
Principals	19.0	8.1	-10.9
	-17.4	-6.7	differences

Despite the low percent of time devoted to discipline directors' rankings with procedures utilized by principals are relatively close in the lowest rank levels, but differ substantially in the top five ranks. Principals seem to devote more time to direct student, teacher and parent contacts related to discipline.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Discipline and Building Control

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Meet with parent and community groups	1	6
- Policy formation with administration and teachers	2	4
- Work with teachers having problems with students and discipline	3	5
- Prepare reports for Superintendent and/or Board of Education	4	8
- Parent contacts re: individual students	5	2
- Work with pupil personnel staff on problems	6	5
- Work with students having problems	7	3
- Conduct Social services and agency referrals	8	9
- Meet with students and representives	9	7
- Vandalism/false alarm avoidance/ follow-up investigations	10	10
- Other * (working with paraprofessionals, etc.)	11	12
- Meet with school attorney and/or court hearing	12.5	13
- Contacts with police officials on student problem and security	12.5	11

Bilingual directors report spending an average of 12.1 percent of their time on business and budget management. This is nearly half again as much as that spent by principals who indicate devoting 9.1 percent to this function. Both Title VII directors and principals desire a reduction in their idealized role functions. Bilingual directors would prefer an average of 10.3 percent being devoted to business affairs, while principals would see 5.9 percent as more to their liking. These percentage views are shown in Figure F.

FIGURE F

BUSINESS AND BUDGET MANAGEMENT

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	12.1	10.3	-1.8
Principals	9.1	5.9	-3.2
	+3.0	+4.4	differences

This listing of specific procedure, includes one additional procedure designed to Title VII directors functions--"negotiate budget with state and federal representatives". Even so, this item ranked 7th and the top five rankings by both directors and principals were identical in terms of procedures involved. They were not ranked identically, but they did emerge as general business/budget functions that were more heavily involved in both directors and principal functions. Other rankings were for the most part quite similar.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Business and Budget Management

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Maintain records and control over program funds	1	5
- Process purchase requests and/or endorse to business office	2	4
- Assemble budget requests into a request program	3	2
- Meet with staff regarding budget needs	4	1

- Meet with central administration to justify budget needs	5	3
- Authorize staff travel and special function requests	6	12
- Negotiate budget with state and federal representatives	7	*
- Prepare special budget justifications	8	8
- Advise central staff on long-range staff budget needs	9	7
- Distribute budget forms to staff and collect	10	6
- Advise and assist supervisors/chairperson on budget tasks	11	9
- Maintain expenditure controls over extra-curricular funds	12	11
- Other *(Maintaining records and reports for evaluation and audit purposes)	13	13
- Supervise, coordinate or serve as liaison with maintenance staff.	14	10

Note: *Item specifically inserted for directors

Scheduling and Coordinating Facilities Use

The special procedures ranked highest by bilingual program directors percentage of time allocated to scheduling and coordinating of facilities use characterizes the 4.0 percent devoted to this function as being primarily direct program and student/teacher support. Principals use of their time was devoted more toward system support, ie., "prepare the master teaching schedule for the year." Principals indicated a desire for a reduction of the 6.6 percent of time actually spent to this function to an idealized 4.4 percent. Directors also wanted a reduction from 4.0 percent to 3.0 percent. These percentage allocations and differences are shown in Figure G.

FIGURE G

SCHEDULING AND COORDINATING FACILITIES USE

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	4.0	3.0	-1.0
Principals	6.6	4.4	-2.2
	-2.6	-1.4	differences

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Scheduling and Facilities Management

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Revise Schedules to meet specific needs of students	1	4
- Coordinate field trip, athletic and theatrical requests	2	7
- Prepare master teaching schedule for the year	3.5	1
- Arrange for substitute teachers	3.5	6
- Coordinate requests for facilites used by outside organizations	4	8
- Coordinate use of special rooms for school programs	5	2
- Do individual scheduling of students	6	12
- Resolve Scheduling conflicts for school events	7	10
- Supervise special events, assemblies and sport events	8	5
- Prepare master room schedule for the year	9	3
- Solve building and grounds repair needs	10	9
- Supervise regular security and maintenance operations	11	11
- Other	12	13

Interaction with Community Groups

Both directors and principals idealize higher percentages of time for interaction with community groups, directors increasing from 8.6 percent actual to 10.4 percent ideal and principals from 6.4 percent actual to 7.3 percent ideal. Figure F displays community interaction function time percentages..

FIGURE F

INTERACTION WITH COMMUNITY GROUPS

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	8.6	10.4	+ 1.8
Principals	6.4	7.3	+ .9
	+2.2	+3.1	differences

Specific procedures utilized by directors and principals are most closely related when direct communications, liaison and representation with formal agencies and communty groups are involved. "Custodial functions" such as safety of participant in school-housed events and money, supply and materials,

supervision resulted in higher rankings by principals then by directors.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Interaction With Community Groups

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Attend meetings to speak about or stimulate school understanding and support	1	4
- Maintain informal relations with agency leaders and representatives	2	1
- Serve as school or educational representative in community groups and/or advisory boards	3	2
- Arrange for speakers, panels and groups to participate in events	4	8
- Plan for and publicize special community--school events	5	3
- Develop programs to cooperate with agencies for student benefit	6	9
- Handle and be responsible for money, supplies and materials	7.5	11
- Develop information sharing processes with agencies for student benefit	7.5	6
- Be on call in emergencies	8	5
- Assist in scholarship selections and other student help programs of community groups	9	10
- Other: (advisory committee activities)	10	13
- Be responsible for welfare and safety of persons involved in school-housed events	11	7
- Coordinate fire and police sponsored youth or school-related services and events	12	12

Self-Improvement and Professional Activities

Actual average time involved in self-improvement and professional activities amounted to 5.0 percent for Title VII directors and 4.3 percent for principals. Both groups of administrators indicated idealized increases of time to this function, 8.2 percent for directors and 6.2 percent for principals.

FIGURE G

SELF-IMPROVEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	5.0	8.2	+3.2
Principals	4.3	6.2	+1.9
	+.07	+2.0	differences

Reading journals and research reports, reviewing new instructional resources and keeping up with general news and information rank among the three highest procedures utilized by both directors and principals as means of professional and self-improvement. Studying legislation and alternatives as well as formal studies in colleges, universities and study council seminars also rank high, within the top 5 ranks for directors and top 7 for principals. Principals see association involvement as 4th ranked, whereas directors rank association activity 8th.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish Self- Improvement and Professional Resource Activities

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principals
- Reading professional journals, research and reports	1	1
- Reviewing new instructional resources	2	2
- Reading general news and information documents	3	3
- Studying impact of legislation and critics' proposals	4	7
- Attend college, university or study council seminars and workshops	5	6
- Attend State Education Department workshops and information meetings	6	11
- Filling out survey and research forms in general	7	5
- Involvement in local, area or state professional association meetings	8	4
- Writing letters to influential persons, legislators	9	12
- Teach in-service, college/adult courses	10	13
- Maintaining/supervising staff-professional library	11	7
- Officership in professional associations	12	10
- Listening to/viewing radio and TV programs	13	9
- Writing articles for journals, news sources, research groups	14	14
- Other	15	15

District-Wide Administrative Duties

Service in behalf of district-wide programs, activities or involvements are a distinct part of directors as well as of principals. Directors reported an average of 11.0 percent actual involvement and indicated an idealized decrease to 8.5 percent. Principals reported less than half that percentage

of involvement, 5.1 percent. Principals also idealized a decrease to 3.0 percent. Figure H displays these percentages and differences.

FIGURE H

DISTRICT-WIDE ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

	ACTUAL	IDEAL	
Directors	11.0	8.5	-2.5
Principals	5.1	3.0	-2.1
	-5.9	-5.5	differences

Among the district-wide duties that ranked the highest were completing of required state/district forms, serving on policy-advisory groups, special program involvements, district planning groups and special superintendent related administrative groups.

Ranking of Specific Procedures Used to Accomplish District-Wide Administrative Duties

Specific Procedure	Directors	Principal
- Complete report forms for district purposes	1.5	2
- Complete State required forms and reports	1.5	4
- Serve on district policy-advisory group, special program area(s) including bilingual	2	3
- Serve on district planning group or similar duties	3	1
- Serve as district representative to area, county, state parent group(s)	4	8
- Serve on special administrative group with superintendent	5	5
- Function in an additional position responsibility *	6	7
- Serve on regional planning group(s) representing district	7	10
- Serve on BOCES advisory/program committee	8	9
- Other	9	11

Note: *Bilingual director respondents were generally responsible for other administrative duties and roles. See item description on titles and function percentages.

FINDINGS -- BILINGUAL PROGRAM ORGANIZATIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Eighty-eight respondents indicated their bilingual position title as requested and also noted the percent of time allocated to bilingual administration responsibilities, as well as any additional titles and percent of time allocations devoted to these other responsibilities. The percent of time declared for the primary bilingual title and responsibility ranged from 20 percent to 100 percent. The most common primary bilingual titles were director, coordinator, manager, and supervisor. Director was indicated by 68.2 percent of the respondents, coordinator by 22.7 percent, 4.5 percent indicated the title manager, and supervisor was also used by 4.5 percent of the respondents.

Over half of the Title VII bilingual administrators, 56.8 percent, indicated full time, i.e., 100% responsibility to bilingual program functions. Less than full time was indicated by 43.2 percent of the Title VII bilingual program administrators. Of these, the percentage range ascribed to bilingual program administration went from a low of 20 percent to a high of 90 percent. Some of the titles ascribed to these other functions were principal, director or coordinator of special projects, teacher training coordinator, primary supervisor, learning implementor, instructional consultant, non-immigrant program coordinator, migrant education coordinator, state bilingual coordinator, director of federal projects, assistant superintendent and bilingual public relations coordinator. Nearly eight percent indicated tertiary titles and responsibilities ranging in time allocations of from 5 to 25 percent. Some of these titles were Lau compliance officer, ESAA Bilingual coordinator and director of adult education.

In relationship to these titles, the bargaining unit identity was ascertained. Nearly two-thirds, 65 percent indicated that they were not

part of a bargaining unit. Twenty percent noted being part of a separate administrator negotiating unit and 15 percent identified membership in the teacher unit.

First funding year was identified for each program. It is interesting to note that 18 percent of the programs were said to be in existence over five years. Programs in existence for three years or less constituted 70.8 percent of the respondent sample.

Funding levels fell largely between $50,000 to $199,000, comprising 75.3 percent of the sample; with 5.6 percent below $50,000; 13.5 percent between $200,000 and $400,000; and, 5.6 percent above $400,000.

Spanish/English programs constituted 88.8 percent of the population responding to the survey. The languages reported were:

TABLE 8

BILINGUAL PROGRAM LANGUAGES REPORTED

Languages	N	%
Spanish/English	79	88.8
Portuguese/English	8	8.9
Navajo/English	7	7.8
Tagalog-Ilocano/English	6	6.7
Chinese/English	4	4.5
Vietnamese/English	2	2.2
French/English	1	1.1
Greek/English	1	1.1
Indo-Chinese/English	1	1.1
Japanese/English	1	1.1

Another program aspect had to do with the number of non-English dominant students served by the bilingual programs being reported. Nearly two thirds, 65.1 percent, served 300 or fewer non-English dominant students, 55.0 percent of these programs served 200 or less. Ten percent of the programs reported serving over 900 non-English dominant children. The remainder, 24.7 percent, serve between 300 and 900 such students.

These programs are located in school districts that have populations of non-English dominant students in the following numbers:

TABLE 9

Non-ENGLISH DOMINANT STUDENTS IN SCHOOL DISTRICT

Numbers	N	%
under 250	16	18.4
250 - 500	10	11.5
501 - 1,000	24	27.6
1,001 - 1,500	6	6.9
1,501 - 2,000	5	5.7
2,001 - 2,500	5	5.7
2,501 - 3,500	6	6.9
3,501 - 5,000	5	5.7
5,001 - 7,500	4	4.6
over 7,500	6	6.9

Thus, 57.5 percent of the school districts involved in this study report having 1,000 or fewer non-English dominant students in the district. Those having between 1,000 and 5,000 non-English dominant students constitute 30.9 percent of the survey group, with 11.5 percent reporting 5,000 or more such students in their school district.

Total school district enrollments ranged from under 1,000 for 11.6 percent of the districts to 41.8 percent having more than 8,000 students. Total district enrollments were reported as follows:

TABLE 10

TOTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT

District Enrollment	N	%
under 1,000	10	11.6
1,001 - 2,000	9	10.4
2,001 - 3,000	8	9.2
3,001 - 4,000	0	0.0
4,001 - 5,000	9	10.5
5,001 - 6,000	2	2.4
6,001 - 7,000	2	2.4
7,001 - 8,000	4	4.7
8,001 and over	36	41.8

It should be obvious from these figures that bilingual program availability is quite restricted when an estimate is made of the total population of non-English dominant students. In addition, it is obvious that a substantial number of these programs are located in large school districts, yet the majority of programs serve less than 200 students.

FINDINGS -- PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Roughly two-thirds of the respondents, 64.3 percent were male and 35.7 percent were female. Age distributions were as follows: 19.8 percent under 30; 37.2 percent between 31 and 40; 30.1 percent between 41 and 50; and, 12.8 percent over 50.

Educational attainment was predominantly at the Masters and 30 or more hours with 60.5 percent of the bilingual directors at this level. Four, or 4.7 percent reported holding a doctorate, one a specialist certificate and two indicated other categories. Twenty-seven, or 31.4 percent indicated holding a Masters degree or Bachelors and 30 or more hours. None said they held only a Bachelors degree.

Certification status was predominantly Supervisory/Administrative with 76.5 percent reporting this type of certification. Only 18.8 percent indicated Teaching certification and 4.7 percent none or other.

Educational and supervisory/administrative experience, as well as Title VII Director experience was ascertained. Over half, 56.8 percent said they had 11 or more years experience in education, 42.1 percent indicated 10 or less years. Experience in education was reported as follows:

TABLE 11

BILINGUAL ADMINISTRATOR EDUCATION EXPERIENCE

Experience	N	%
1 to 3 years	6	6.9
4 to 6 years	13	14.8
7 to 10 years	18	20.4
11 to 20 years	34	38.6
20 and over	16	18.2

Administrative or supervisory experience was reported largely in the 6 years or less categories, 65.5 percent of the bilingual directors fall into this category. Supervisor/administrator experience was reported as follows:

TABLE 12

BILINGUAL DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

Experience	N	%
under 3 years	35	40.2
4 - 6 years	22	25.3
7 - 10 years	13	14.9
11 - 20 years	14	16.1
20 years and over	3	3.4

Experience specifically as a Title VII Director, obviously maximized by the limits of the statute to no more than 8 years, was reported as follows:

TABLE 13

EXPERIENCE AS TITLE VII DIRECTOR

Experience	N	%
1 to 2 years	57	66.3
3 to 4 years	21	24.4
5 to 6 years	6	7.0
7 to 8 years	2	2.3

A final question dealing with personal characteristics was posed to the respondents. Noting that the response was wholly voluntary each was asked to indicate what they saw as their own ethnic background. Eighty-six of the 90 respondents answered this question. Fifty-two, or 86.6 percent, identified Mexican American/Chicano; Four said "Anglo"; three said Irish; and one each identified the following: American Indian, Anglo and Cherokee; Anglo (English/Scotch/Norwegian); Anglo(Bilingual-Bicultural-Biliterate); Anglo/ Hispano; Argentine; Colonial white american and some kind of early Indian; Hondurena; Hualapa: Indian-1st American; Italian-German; Navajo; Pacific Islander; Philippino(mother) and Dutch(father); Polish; Rumanian/German; Scotch-English; and, "WASP." Het rogeneity is an obvious quality of the cadre of bilingual program directors responding to this study.

Comments on Success, Lack of Success and Training

Title VII administrators were asked to comment on factors they believed were most significantly related to success and lack of success in accomplishing the bilingual program administrator's role. Over 90 percent of the respondents saw fit to provide comments on these items.

Factors they saw as being related to success can be characterized by the following phrases:

... the support of a sympathetic school board and upper administration;

... ability to communicate with teachers, principals and the community;

... ability to inform and influence parents and administrators in general programs;

... ability to get along with and to unite staff, to provide leadership;

... administrative ability, human relations ability, being able to work with people and coordinate the programs;

... it is critical to be well organized, flexible and able to delegate;

... getting along with all staff members and maintaining interactions with and among the staff;

... knowledge of the districts' policies, personnel and business procedures.

Factors identified by the Title VII directors as being hinderances or significantly related to lack of success in the administration of biliingual programs can be characterized as follows:

... lack of skills necessary for administering programs;

... lack of understanding of bilingual goals on the part of the "regular" staff and fellow administrators;

... lack of commitment by the school board, superintendent and community leaders;

... tendency to have bilingual program viewed as a temporary special project;

... lack of sufficient support staff and of bilingual personnel at the administrative level;

... coordinators are spread too thin, they have very little authority and mounds of responsibility, can't meet objectives;

... pulling teachers out of the classroom and putting them into administration without management background;

... administrators who see their buildings as a private castle and are threatened by a special program.

The Title VII directors were also asked to indicate training aspects, courses, experiences, in-service programs that they felt ought to be included in the backgrounds of bilingual administrators. Here is what some of them said:

... case studies of administrators and studying their behavior;

... lots of training in the affective area in order to deal with people and cope with school district administration;

... administrative workshops dealing with techniques, procedures, program management, business management, budget requirements and project management;

... management training emphasizing planning, evaluation, general administration and communications;

... communications and community relations training is the most vital skill area;

... supervisory experience before being made a fully responsible program administrator;

... special training in linguistics and the cultures of both the 1st and 2nd language areas, including awareness of special problems in transition to ESL;

... experience in dealing with the general community and in the development of community involvement programs.

It is interesting to note that relatively few comments isolated specific bilingual aspects as being related to either success or failure, or as training needs. An in depth investigation of success and failure factors would be particularly useful, since these comments do not seem to support elements being designed into the preparation programs being developed in most institutions purporting to training administrative and supervisory personnel for bilingual programs.

PART III

SUMMARY

This study of Title VII Bilingual Program Directors was undertaken to determine:

1. the functions bilingual program directors performed and how much time they allocated to each function, as well as how much time these directors would ideally allocate to each function;
2. the specific procedures and techniques used to accomplish these functions;
3. the general parameters of the position, including staffing patterns, titles and responsibilities held, reporting responsibilities and salaries;
4. the general characteristics of programs, including length of operation, student characteristics, languages and cultures involved, funding level, and judgements regarding operational autonomy;
5. personal/professional demographic information, including sex, age, experience, certification, education and ethnic background;
6. the judgements of the bilingual program directors regarding factors they feel are related to success/failure in the accomplishment of the bilingual program administrators role, including observations on suggested training and background aspects needed by bilingual program administrators.

Comparison of the data from the bilingual administrator study was made with data from a study of school principals thereby providing a comparison of the Title VII directors role with that of an established administrative role, the school principal. The study instrument used was adapted from the instrument used earlier in the study of school principals.

A total of 225 Title VII directors in six selected states were included in the study, of these 90 returned useable responses thereby providing a 40 percent useable response. Data was analyzed using percentages, average percentages, derived means and simple ranking techniques.

BILINGUAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: SOME COMARISONS

Both bilingual directors and principals, in the study samples used, administer programs that are roughly two-thirds at the elementary level and one-third at the secondary level. Over eighty percent of the principals administer one building unit, compared to only fourteen percent of the bilingual directors who administer only one unit. Over fifty percent of the bilingual directors are responsible for four or more instructional locations. Bilingual administrators are more likely to be responsible for smaller administrative units involving fewer than 400 students, less than 25 professional staff, with fewer non-instructional support staff, little administrative assistance, but with more instructional aides. Principals were more likely to administer slightly larger units involving nearly 600 students, approximately 50 staff, a variety of administrative and supervisory staff, more non-instructional support staff, and far fewer instructional aides.

Seventy percent of the bilingual directors were operating programs in school settings classified as "low socioeconomic/high minority", compared to over 46 percent of the principals who were responsible for school units with student bodies characterized as "middle socioeconomic/low minority".

Commenting on a sense of autonomy, thirty-six percent of the bilingual directors indicated that they judged themselves to be "highly autonomous" when dealing with program administration. By comparison only twenty-six percent of the principals selected "highly autonomous". When both "high" and "moderate" categories of autonomy were compared with "moderate" and "high" in the restricted category, approximately three-fourths of both bilingual directors and principals indicated judgements of autonomy. Only one fourth of each group indicated a restricted dimension where program administration was concerned.

Salary differences were discernible with directors median salaries estimated to be somewhere in the $17,500 to $20,000 range. Principals median salaries were estimated to be in the $22,500 to $25,000 range.

ALLOCATIONS OF TIME TO FUNCTIONS COMPARISONS

Actual and idealized mean percentage of time allocations are presented in the following table.

TABLE 14

ACTUAL AND IDEALIZED TIME ALLOCATIONS
TO FUNCTIONS OF BILINGUAL
DIRECTORS AND SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Areas of Major Functional Responsibility	Actual Time		Ideal Time	
	Dir.	Prin.	Dir.	Prin.
Curriculum & Program Development	17.6	14.6	22.5	21.1
Instructional Supervision	10.7	19.1	14.6	26.3
Non-teaching Supervision	8.1	5.4	6.9	3.9
Professional staff Recruitment & Training	9.1	5.1	9.7	6.5
Discipline & Building Control	1.6	19.0	1.4	8.1
Business & Budget Management	12.1	9.1	10.3	5.9
Scheduling & Coordinating Facilities Use	4.0	6.6	3.0	4.4
Interaction with Community Groups	8.6	6.4	10.4	2.3
Self-Improvement & Professional Activities	4.9	4.3	8.2	6.3
District-Wide Administrative Duties	10.9	5.1	8.5	3.0
Negotiations	1.3	.8	1.0	.4
Other	2.3	--	1.7	--

In general, findings on actual time allocations configure bilingual directors spending more of their time on curriculum and program development, business and budget management, district-wide administrative duties, professional staff recruitment and training, non-teaching staff supervision, and interaction with community groups than do principals. Principals spend considerably more time on discipline and building control and instructional supervision than do the directors of bilingual programs, and some more time on scheduling and coordinating facilities use. Both directors and principals spend about the same amount of time on self-improvement and professional activities and a negligible amount on negotiations activities.

Bilingual directors and principals tend to idealize time allocations in the same direction, i.e., both desire increases in time allocations to curriculum and program development, instructional supervision, interaction with community groups, professional staff recruitment and training, and self-improvement and professional activities. Both groups also desire reductions in time allocations in business and budget management, district-wide administrative duties, non-teaching staff supervision, scheduling and coordinating facilities use, and discipline and building control. With the last function, discipline, the reduction desired by principals was massive compared to the directors. Principals reported actually spending 19.0 percent of their time on discipline and desired a reduction to 8.1 percent, compared to directors who reported spending 1.6 percent of their time on discipline and desired a reduction to 1.4 percent, a negligible revision at most. The rankings of specific procedures utilized in the accomplishment of the major functions were, for the most part, reasonably similar. In most rankings top, middle and bottom thirds of those procedures were nearly identical with mixed rankings within each third. Widest variation in rankings appeared in those major functional areas showing the greatest difference in percent of time allocations.

BILINGUAL PROGRAM DEMOGRAPHICS

Over two-thirds of the bilingual administrators indicated using the title director, one-fifth said they were classified as coordinators. Slightly more than half the respondents declared that they were functioning 100% as bilingual administrators. The rest indicated second and tertiary assignments ranging from 20 percent to 90 percent of their overall responsibilities. Most secondary and tertiary titles suggested special project and/or system-wide functions.

Bargaining unit representation was declared for less than a third of the directors, of these there was a nearly equal distribution between a separate administrative unit and a teachers bargaining unit. Most bilingual programs reported being first funded within the last three years, however, nearly a fifth indicated being first funded more than five years ago. Most programs fall within the $50,000 to $200,000 range, the majority being devoted to Spanish/English programs. Non-English dominant students served by most programs fall below 300 students, despite the fact that nearly a third of the districts involved report between 500 and 1,500 such students in the total district. Over 36 percent report non-English dominant student populations in excess of 1,500, with over 11 percent having more than 5,000 such students. Over half the districts report total enrollments in excess of 5,000 students.

BILINGUAL DIRECTORS -- PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Slightly more than one-third of the directors are female, the largest number are between the ages of 31 and 40 and nearly two-thirds hold Masters degrees plus 30 hours or more of graduate study. Over three-fourths of the directors hold supervisory or administrative certification. Over half have 11 or more years of experience in education, with nearly three-fourths having 6 years or less of administrative experience. Over two-thirds have been Title VII Directors for 2 or less years. The ethnic make-up of directors, closely paralleling the program orientations reported earlier, is over half Mexican American/Chicano with several other Hispanic orientations, bringing the total for that ethnic identification to nearly 60 percent of the directors. However, the wide variety of multiple ethnic orientations identified by the remaining directors projects a rich and exciting sense of cultural diversity in this group of educational leaders.

FACTORS RELATED TO SUCCESS, LACK OF SUCCESS AND TRAINING NEEDS

Most of the comments on factors judged to be related to success dealt with the need for top level organizational support, community support and peer administrator understanding. The skills needed by bilingual administrators were essentially in the human areas involving communications capability, interpersonal skills, coordinative and unity generating leadership capability. Many also supported the need for administrative capability, a sense of organization, delegatory capability and knowledge of administrative policies and business procedures.

Lack of success was ascribed to factors falling very much at the opposite extreme from the success factors noted above. The difference being that where human skills areas were ascribed to be most related to success, lack of success was ascribed to be most related to deficiencies in administrative, management, business and organizational skills. The need for commitment and support from the board, all levels of administration, fellow teachers and broadly based community understanding were also seen as important aspects.

Training experiences were wide ranging, however, most dealt with enlarged understanding and skills in human leadership, with considerable attention to self-understanding and behavioral awareness of leaders. Another highly recommended area included management skills training in all aspects from planning thru evaluation, heavily on business and program control. The need need for prior successful supervisory experience was emphasized, especially before assignment to a fully responsible administrative position. In addition, experience with community participation activities was highly recommended.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that bilingual administrators, when viewed on the basis of functions performed and preferred, have much in common with certain general administrators in school districts, namely school principals. How much they

have in common seems to be tempered by several observations that can be made from the data gathered in this study.

First, a far larger number of bilingual administrators than was expected seem to have substantial administrative responsibility beyond their bilingual program functions. This being the case, there is a large question as to whether or not we have comparisons that reflect the commonality of those general functions with the principals or whether we are viewing commonalities between bilingual program administration and principalship functions.

Second, bilingual program management seems to be characterized by multiple unit responsibilities, rather than single unit responsibility as typified by the principals. The large amount of time devoted to discipline and building control by principals, compared to bilingual directors who reported slight involvement with discipline, is probably a reflection of this difference. Beyond this, many directors alluded to building principals being threatened or guarded about "their building", a question of turf and a potential source of conflict that directors related to their own success or lack of success as administrators.

Third, both the bilingual directors and the principals seem to be reasonably attuned to similar job profiles. Both groups adjusted their idealized time allocations in the same directions. Neither group manifested idealizing that was the reverse of the other, thus their time functions profiles were all adjusted in the same direction for every function, indicating an interesting similarity in role aspirations.

Fourth, it would appear that bilingual administrators are well educated and report high levels of certification in supervison and/or administration.

Yet, there were a number of evidences that they have not had significant amounts of administrative experience beyond Title VII Director assignments, despite being well into the middle age groups and educational experience levels. Also, despite training level and certification, the directors point to large needs for management, administration and human leadership training. This leaves questions regarding the nature of the programs they have been exposed to and whether or not they would have been given access to administrative positions had not the need for bilingual leadership not emerged.

NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study suggests the need for at least the three additional research studies suggested below:

1. A study of bilingual administrators and principals, drawn from the same organizational settings and manifesting congruence in as many organizational aspects as possible, including size of district, student characteristics, program support, staff size, single unit responsibility, and the like. This study could utilize a further adaptation of the instrument used here, with modification of the specific procedures choices being highly recommended, using a combined sample of bilingual administrators and school principals to suggest appropriate items.

2. A study of bilingual administrators and special education administrators, utilizing parts of this instrument as adapted, but adding an in-depth interview stage to develop more fully some of the problems associated with leadership based upon advocacy of special client needs and programs located in multiple settings. This study should include in-depth interview with corollary unit principals or managers having responsibility for building control and staff supervision.

3. A study of bilingual directors and principals located in large urban school systems, compared with similar functionaries located in small districts either rural/suburban or small city.

Each of the above listed studies should include some form of aspirational measure regarding recommended goals for bilingual education as well as for general education.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Carter, Thomas P. Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

English, Fenwick W. School Organization and Management. Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1975.

Hersey, Paul and Blanchard, Kenneth H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Jones, James J., Salisbury, C. Jackson and Spencer, Ralph L. Secondary School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Kast, Fremont E. and Rosenzweig, James E. Organization and Management: A Systems Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Sanchez, Gilbert. An Analysis of the Bilingual Education Act, 1967-68. Ed.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 1972.

State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review. "School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools." March 1974.

_____. "The Public School Principal." December 1974.

_____. "The Superintendent of Schools - His Role, Background and Salary." June 1974.

Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Clearinghouse Publication No. 51. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Development Associates, Inc., 1973.

_____. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation. First Report by the U. S. Commissioner of Education to the President and the Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Wagstaff, Lonnie H. and Spillman, Russell. "Who Should Be a Principal?" National Elementary Principal, Vol. LIII, No. 5, July-August 1974.